



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
WWW.USPTO.GOV

Paper No. None

FREDERICK W. GIBB, III  
GIBB INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW FIRM, LLC  
2568-A RIVA ROAD  
SUITE 304  
ANNAPOLIS MD 21401

**COPY MAILED**

**JAN 19 2007**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of :  
Jeffrey H. Dreibelbis et al. :  
Application No. 10/707,971 : DECISION ON PETITION  
Filed: January 29, 2004 : UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.181  
Attorney Docket No. :  
BUR920030154US1 :  
Title: REMOTE BIST HIGH SPEED :  
TEST AND REDUNDANCY CALCULATION :

This is a decision on the petition filed on October 23, 2006, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.181, requesting that the holding of abandonment in the above-identified application be withdrawn.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the non-final Office action, mailed March 9, 2006, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three months. No response was received, and no extensions of time under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) were requested. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on May 10, 2006. A notice of abandonment was mailed on October 4, 2006.

With the present petition, Petitioner has alleged that the mailing was not received. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner stating that the Office communication was not received by the practitioner and attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office communication was not received. In addition, a copy of the docket record where the non-received Office communication

would have been entered had it been received and docketed must be attached to and referenced in practitioner's statement<sup>1</sup>.

Petitioner has met the requirements of Delgar v. Schuyler, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), in that he has asserted that the Office communication was not received, that he has searched both the file jacket and the docket record, and he has included a copy of the latter.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue, as set forth on petition, it is concluded that Petitioner has met his burden of establishing that the mailing was not received.

Accordingly, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181(a) is **GRANTED**. The holding of abandonment is **WITHDRAWN**.

The Technology Center will be notified of this decision. The Technology Center's support staff will re-mail the communication of March 9, 2006, and will set a new period for response.

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225<sup>2</sup>. All other inquiries concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.



**Paul Shanowski**  
**Senior Attorney**  
**Office of Petitions**  
**United States Patent and Trademark Office**

---

<sup>1</sup> See MPEP 711.03(c).

<sup>2</sup> Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. §1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's further action(s).